

02-277

From: Janet Harrison
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 4:45 PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

Janet Harrison (pepperadams@erarthlink.net) writes:

Hi Commissioner Adelstein, I want to thank you for your efforts to prevent the loosening of FCC regulations on media ownership. I am totally opposed to greater media consolidation. I went to the hearing in SF last Saturday. Thank you for that great event. I signed up to speak but had to leave before my turn. I did get video taped out in the hallway and expressed my views. I am a public school teacher, member of AFT, Local 3267. We need more public discourse, dialogue and genuine input. I mailed you a copy of the letter I sent to Senator Boxer at 445 12th St SW, Washington. I assume that's correct. Again, thank you for your hard work. Janet Harrison

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 216.244.43.44
Remote IP address: 216.244.43.44

From: Larry McFatter
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 4:51 PM
Subject: FCC Decisions

As American citizens who have turned increasingly to the BBC and other news outlets in order to get a broader perspective on the Iraq invasion, the Mid-East crisis and many other issues, we want the FCC to know that we do NOT want the control of the media in the hands of a few, such as Clear Channel. Our country has been able to survive because the ordinary citizenry could access news, opinions, and analysis from a variety of voices. *We are adamantly opposed to media megaliths* controlling print, t.v. and radio, thus limiting even further the information we need to be educated citizens.

We urge the FCC NOT to relax the standing restraints on media ownership and control.

Sincerely,
Deborah McFatter
Larry McFatter

From: Margaret Bartenhagen
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 5:18 PM
Subject: Media Consolidation

Dear Mr. Powell:

I am writing to you concerning the upcoming June 2 vote by the FCC regarding further media consolidations.

I am concerned because I have not seen much about this issue in the general media. It seems that debate about this issue -- the pros & cons -- have not been fully aired and this issue has really not been fully examined. We are, after all, talking about administering the public airwaves and who gets to do that.

Who, in fact, will get to decide what I and every other citizen of this country sees and hears? Who will decide what is "appropriate" for public consumption and what should be held back or suppressed? Even now more effort is required to get a holistic view of world events and national issues. If there are fewer and larger "owners" (a media "monopoly" so to speak) of the TV, radio and print sources of information, how much greater is the risk of not getting broad and unbiased information on a myriad of important and relevant topics?

These are important questions, Mr. Powell, and I don't think they have been adequately addressed. I would urge the FCC to deny further consolidation of the media because I believe it is in the best interests of the public to do so.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Margaret P. Bartenhagen

From: fredmarion
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 5:18 PM
Subject: Media Ownership Rules

Dear M. Powell et al:

I am an individual American who values her democracy and desires to have a variety of sources of information. I understand that there will be a meeting at the FCC on 6/2 to determine whether or not the media ownership restriction rules should be eased or eliminated.

I urge you and the rest of the FCC making the decision NOT to ease these rules and, in fact, believe they should be tightened in some cases.

Our Democracy is dependent upon the public being able to hear dissenting positions on issues, and recent media coverage should bring home most clearly that information is being controlled by the limited number of outlets. I also bring your attention to ENRON, which spearheaded deregulation of the energy markets, resulting in many consumers being gouged on energy costs and we know the rest of the story.

I, for one, don't wish to see programming that is selected based on the bottom line or the political positions of the few moguls owning media outlets. Remember, these outlets are supposed to be owned by the Public. That's us.

Sincerely,
Marion Slater
Apollo Beach, FL

From: George Andrews
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 5:22 PM
Subject: Consolidation of Media Ownership

TO: FCC Chairman, Michael K. Powell
mpowell@fcc.gov

Copies To: Schiff, Boxer, Feinstein. Commissioners Abernathy, Copps, Martin, & Adelstein. Members of the Senate Subcommittee on Communications.

Dear Sir,

I am outraged that the FCC seems to be about to ram through rule changes affecting media concentration without adequate time for commissioners or the public to study the proposal. What is the hurry? Is there a hidden agenda YOU do not want to be publicly scrutinized??? I hope not!

The commission and its people - YOU - are supposed to be the peoples representative in matters affecting this publicly owned resource, the airwaves! I don't care one wit about whether you believe you have a legal or administrative right to skip public debate. I expect you to fulfill your obligation to the public to actually represent us. The only way you can legitimately do that is by listening to us. The only way we can meaningfully speak is to first know the issues, and have time to consider them. I expect you to fulfill your obligations to us, the public.

There is absolutely no chance that I would accept that issues of media consolidation can be considered a minor administrative matter! It is a MAJOR matter!!! If the commission - if YOU - hurry and push through rules changes, and then we later find out it was a mistake, correcting it will be very difficult (AFTER the consolidation has occurred!). What is YOUR hurry? Why are YOU doing this, when there is no legitimate need to hurry????

I wish to make my voice heard. I do not want further consolidation of TV or any media. In fact, I want consolidation to be reduced! Many people that I know personally have noticed (as have I) the degradation of TV. The more consolidation that has occurred, the worse it has gotten. News isn't news anymore - it is agendized propaganda, sensationalism, voyeurism, entertainment, and commercialism. Entertainment programs seem to be written by 11 to 13 year old boys, pandering to the basest of human desires and to voyeurism. (NOTE: I taught this age group!) I have 3 under-age granddaughters. They should not be exposed to the trash now on TV.

If TV had freer access by independent producers, it very likely wouldn't make matters worse, and very likely would produce more diversity. The market place would then function as it should.

Make no mistake. The matter of our very freedom as a people is at stake here. Consolidation of the means of mass communications greatly heightens the possibility of special interests manipulating public opinion, so as to achieve a private agenda. That could be a political party, the party in office, a commercial agenda, or a social engineering

agenda. (Whoever the owners happen to support!) A lot of that is going on now. It is quite obvious! IT IS QUITE OUTRAGEOUS! For us to remain a powerful and just nation, it is absolutely mandatory that we have a free press, and TV is the major part of the press today. I dont want the press to be controlled by any entity or small group, be it a part of government, a politically agendized group, or commercial interest!

As I see it, there would be absolutely NO benefit TO THE PUBLIC to allow consolidation to increase. The only groups that COULD benefit would do so AT THE PUBLICS EXPENSE!

Please do YOUR DUTY, as the public perceives it to be. Go slow. Inform the public. Allow the public (and the commissioners) time to digest, to respond, and to debate the responses.

Thank you,
George Andrews

CC: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

From: virginia HUBER
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 5:26 PM
Subject: Preserve Diversity and Media Ownership Limits - DO NOT Remove Remaining Regulatory Limits on Corporations

virginia HUBER
1790 SIDNEY AV BLD1,APT202
PORT ORCHARD,, WA 98366

May 3, 2003

Chairman, Federal Communications Commission Michael Powell
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street., SW
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Chairman, Federal Communications Commission Powell:

The FCC must NOT further weaken the rules that help preserve competition and diversity among the owners of American media.

I am writing to you today to comment on Docket No. 02-277, The Biennial Review of the FCC's broadcast media ownership rules. In its goals to promote competition, diversity and localism in today's media market, I strongly believe that the FCC should retain all of the current media ownership rules now in question. These rules serve the public interest by limiting the market power of already huge companies in the broadcast industry. Corporate control limits investigative journalism and responsibility. Our journalists deserve to pursue topics that affect the very existence of what we hope will remain "democracy."

The FCC is currently considering sweeping changes to broadcast ownership rules. Repeal of or further modification to these rules will likely open the door to more mergers that will continue to reduce competition and diversity in the media. If the rules are weakened further, one company in a city could control the most popular newspaper, TV station and possibly the cable system, giving it dominant influence over the content and slant of news and information. Such a move would reduce the diversity of cultural and political discussion in this country. Media ownership would be concentrated by corporate monopolies even further, and the public's ability to have open, informed discussion with diverse viewpoints would be compromised.

I do not believe that the studies commissioned by the FCC accurately demonstrate the negative affects media deregulation and consolidation have had on media diversity. While there may be indeed be more sources of media than ever before, the spectrum of views presented have become more limited.

The right to carry on informed debate and discussion of current events is part of the founding philosophy of our nation. Our forefathers believed that democracy was best served by a diverse marketplace of ideas. If the FCC allows our media outlets to merge, our ability to have open, informed

discussion with a wide variety of viewpoints will be compromised.

The public interest will best be served by preserving media ownership rules in question in this proceeding.

I think it is important for the FCC to not only consider the points of view of those with a financial interest in this issue, but also those with a social or civic interest.

With the serious impact these rule changes will have on our democracy, it is incumbent on the Commission to take the time to review these issues more thoroughly and allow the American people to have a meaningful say in the process.

Sincerely,

Virginia Rollo Huber

From: lberky@aol.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 5:31 PM
Subject: broadcast ownership rules

Please do not relax the broadcast ownership rules as we need them to protect us from media monopolies. If you relax these rules the media conglomerates will only air their points of view. That way we will only hear one side of the issues and only what they want us to hear. We deserve to hear all points of view regardless of whether the owners approve of the views or not. We need a healthy political debate on all the issues.

Ivan Berkshire
Oklahoma City, Ok.
73108-5603

CC: Kathleen Abernathy

From: Gwen Roe
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 5:32 PM
Subject: Keep Regulations in place for media ownership

Deregulation in many situations has often led towards increased competition, more options and lower prices for consumers. This does not, however, seem to be the trend in ownership in the broadcast industry, particularly with respect to the radio and television news media.

Please keep the regulations in place regarding ownership of these media services.

--

Gwen Roe

gwenroe@optonline.net

From: Bradford Clark Wilson
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 5:35 PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

Bradford Clark Wilson (bradwilsoniaq@hotmail.com) writes:

Please remember South Dakota and vote against corporations taking control of our airways. We are already inundated with news that they choose for us to view and not view. As a free man, I desire to choose what I see and hear. Any rationalization that a media corporation has my best interest at heart is naive and bogus. Thank You, Brad Wilson, Sioux Falls, South Dakota.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 24.220.155.95
Remote IP address: 24.220.155.95

From: Rosalie Gillmore
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 5:42 PM
Subject: June 2, 2003 vote

Dear Chairman Powell:

I would like to express my concern about your decision to call a vote on June 2, 2003, to change the rules of the current Communications Act that was enacted in the 1930's. The rules provided in that Act work very well in today's advanced age of telecommunications and the need for more competition - not less - is imperative where freedom of speech is concerned. You speak of competition in the new age of telecommunications. I agree. Why haven't you encouraged the major TV and radio networks and the Internet providers to report this major news item that the FCC plans to vote on June 2, 2003, to change the current Communications Act and your reasons why it should be changed?

Before a decision to change the Communications Act is made, a thorough discussion between the public and the FCC should be held and that has not happened because the public has not been fully informed about the changes proposed by the FCC. More time for discussion is needed before a vote is taken.

The major television stations that present the news, the major newspapers around the country, the Internet, all the radio stations broadcasting in the U.S. and the FCC directors must inform the public of the major changes proposed before a vote is taken.

The U.S. government in the 1930's was aware of freedom of speech and competition in the workplace as is the U.S. government of 2003. After all, our Constitution was written over 200 years ago and no one is criticizing it! It worked then and it works now. In the early days of TV there was quality programming - as well as poor programming - and the public had choices. Now the only choice for decent programming is on Public Broadcasting Stations so we pay for that as well as cable TV. Radio is abominable because a few large corporations are buying radio markets across the country and there is little if any objective broadcasting. The same is happening in TV news. What needs changing is that large corporations should not have a monopoly in all areas of the media.

Please extend the vote to change the Communications Act until the public has had time to digest the changes proposed. Thank you for your attention.

Rosalie Gillmore Gillmore_R@msn.com

From: Rob Speer
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 5:42 PM
Subject: media ownership

Please do not lift the present caps on media ownership. You do not realize the implications of such a move. We're talking about potential state-controlled media. I and my colleagues strongly protest this resolution. If you care at all about preserving the integrity of this country, PLEASE DO NOT remove the current restrictions to media ownership. Rob Speer

Rob

From: George & Betty O'Brien
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 5:52 PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

George & Betty O'Brien (bgobrien@sbcglobal.net) writes:

Dear Commissioner Adelstein; It is with great concern for democracy in the U.S. that we are writing to you. We are asking that you not support the crossmedia legislation. We are sure you know our reasoning and will not bore you with a discussion, but we can let you know how we feel! Sincerely, George & Betty O'Brien

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 66.159.177.141
Remote IP address: 66.159.177.141

From: Katherine A. Browning
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 5:53 PM
Subject: Fcc

Dear Chairman Powell

Re: Upcoming FCC vote on media deregulation.

Further consolidation of the media in the name of "deregulation" must be halted. The media companies have failed in their public trust to provide unbiased information about most crucial issues, most notably the recent coverage of the war in Iraq. As an American concerned about our democracy, I call on you to challenge the media conglomerates, to open the broadcast spectrum to a diverse range of journalists and opinions, and to reinstate the Fairness Doctrine. I oppose media deregulation.

Sincerely

Katherine Browning

From: Marissa Madrigal
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 5:55 PM
Subject: No consolidation!

Dear Mr. Powell,

My family and I believe that it is not in the public interest. If you're going to do anything, in fact, allow more voices on the airwaves.

Thank you.

M. Madrigal and family.

From: Gail Cirata
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 5:56 PM
Subject: Pending Deregulation

I have only just become aware of the FCC's pending vote on further deregulation of the media.
I can only think this is a sad thing for our country.

When I was in school I was taught that the airwaves were for the people and the FCC had the responsibility of regulating them.

The media is so monopolized by corporate and commercial business that I simply cannot believe the FCC would consider further deregulation.

I sincerely hope the commissioners of the FCC will consider the people of the United States and the airwaves that we thought belonged to us.

Please keep them open to all and not owned and programmed only by the corporations.

We all lose with more deregulation.

With deregulation lose our artists, our culture, our creativity, our independence.

Most sincerely,

Gail

Gail Cirata, Broker-Associate
SUN CITY LINCOLN HILLS
PH: 800-483-4834 x7515
Direct Line: 916-434-7515
Email: gcirata@delwebb.com
Fax: 916-434-7509

From: Rosalie Gillmore
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 5:57 PM
Subject: June 2, 2003 vote

Dear Commissioner Adelstein:

I would like to express my concern about Commission Chairman Powell's decision to call a vote on June 2, 2003, to change the rules of the current Communications Act that was enacted in the 1930's. The rules provided in that Act work very well in today's advanced age of telecommunications and the need for more competition - not less - is imperative where freedom of speech is concerned. Chairman Powell speaks of competition in the new age of telecommunications. I agree. Why hasn't he encouraged the major TV and radio networks and the Internet providers to report this major news item that the FCC plans to vote on June 2, 2003, to change the current Communications Act and his reasons why it should be changed?

Before a decision to change the Communications Act is made, a thorough discussion between the public and the FCC should be held and that has not happened because the public has not been fully informed about the changes proposed by the FCC. More time for discussion is needed before a vote is taken.

The major television stations that present the news, the major newspapers around the country, the Internet, all the radio stations broadcasting in the U.S. and the FCC directors must inform the public of the major changes proposed before a vote is taken.

The U.S. government in the 1930's was aware of freedom of speech and competition in the workplace as is the U.S. government of 2003. After all, our Constitution was written over 200 years ago and no one is criticizing it! It worked then and it works now. In the early days of TV there was quality programming - as well as poor programming - and the public had choices. Now the only choice for decent programming is on Public Broadcasting Stations so we pay for that as well as cable TV. Radio is abominable because a few large corporations are buying radio markets across the country and there is little if any objective broadcasting. The same is happening in TV news. What needs changing is that large corporations should not have a monopoly in all areas of the media.

Please extend the vote to change the Communications Act until the public has had time to digest the changes proposed. Thank you for your attention.

Rosalie Gillmore Gillmore_R@msn.com

From: Barbara Cameron
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 2:59 PM
Subject: broadcast ownership rules

Dear sir:

I urge you not to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies.

These proposed changes would pave the way for giant media conglomerates to gain near-total control of radio and television news and information in communities across our nation. And many of the corporations that are now lobbying the FCC to relax these ownership rules already have a known track record in attempting to keep opposing viewpoints off the air.

The American people deserve to hear more than one point of view on important issues. Therefore, for the sake of our democracy and our freedom, I urge you to continue the broadcast ownership protections that, for decades, have helped to ensure a healthy political debate in our country.

Sincerely,
George F. Cameron
Harwich, Massachusetts 02645-2040

CC: Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

From: itzam
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 3:00 PM
Subject: No Further Consolidation of Media Ownership

Mr. Powell,

Please, please, for the sake of our democratic principles, do not allow continued consolidation of media ownership. There are obvious reasons why regulations limiting media ownership were created. You must know the history. The homogenous news reporting on major media outlets is frightening. Currently I have to look to media sources outside of the USA to get complete and unbiased news. Most Americans get a very narrow view of world events. Please don't make the situation any worse. Thank you.

From: dana tiger
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 3:05 PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

dana tiger (danatiger@hotmail.com) writes:

Please stand up and say no to the takeover of the airwaves by huge corporations. There is no diversity of opinion in the media.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 216.88.82.224
Remote IP address: 216.88.82.224

From: Meerabai@aol.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 3:08 PM
Subject: June 2 vote

I AM VEHEMENTLY OPPOSED TO the proposed de-regulation of the 1034 law. I hope you will listen to the voice of the people.

Joan Jacobs
1096 Lower Shipps Bend N
Centerville, TN 37033

From: itzam
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 3:08 PM
Subject: No further consolidation of media ownership

Mr. Adelstein,

Please, please, for the sake of our democratic principles, do not allow continued consolidation of media ownership. There are obvious reasons why regulations limiting media ownership were created. You must know the history. The homogenous news reporting on major media outlets is frightening. Currently I have to look to media sources outside of the USA to get complete and unbiased news. Most Americans get a very narrow view of world events. Please don't make the situation any worse. Thank you.

Jim Norton, Cambria, CA

From: ALLARDW@aol.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 3:12 PM
Subject: media monopolies

Dear Mr. Powell:

I urge you NOT to relax the broadcast rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies.

These proposed changes would pave the way for giant media conglomerates to gain near-total control of radio and TV news and information in communities across our nation. And many of the corporations that are now lobbying the FCC to relax these ownership rules already have a known track record in attempting to keep opposing viewpoints off the air.

The American people deserve to hear more than one point of view on important issues. Therefore, for the sake of our democracy and our freedom, I urge you to continue the broadcast ownership protections that, for decades, have helped to ensure a healthy political debate in our country.

Sincerely,

William J. Allard
Bayville, NY 11709

From: Meerabai@aol.com
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 3:12 PM
Subject: OPPOSED TO JUNE 2 VOTE

PLEASE DO NOT CHANGE THE 1934 LAW. WE, THE PUBLIC OWN THE AIRWAVES. WE DO NOT WANT THIS. YOU HAVE NO RIGHT TO ACT THIS WAY FOR US. LISTEN TO THE PEOPLE.

JOAN JACOBS
CENTERVILLE, TN